Attachment B 11/25/2009

	Attachment B 11/25/2009
1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(05-16-2006, 9:05 o'clock a.m., defendant present)
3	THE COURT: Good morning. Would the Clerk please
4	call the case?
5	THE CLERK: This is the case of United States of
6	America versus Daniel Wilson Testerman, Criminal Case Number
7	1:05-CR-4. Will Counsel please note their appearance?
8	MR. PERRI: David Perri for the United States.
9	MR. COSENZA: George Cosenza on behalf of the
10	defendant.
11	THE COURT: All right. Good morning to both of you.
12	Mr. Testerman, would you please stand? Would you raise your
13	right hand and would the Clerk please administer the oath to
14	Mr. Testerman?
15	(The defendant was sworn)
16	THE CLERK: Thank you.
17	THE COURT: Thank you. You can be seated, Mr.
18	Testerman. Mr. Testerman, you're now under oath and if you
19	do offer testimony during this hearing that is later
20	determined to be false in a material respect you could
21	subject yourself to a further charge of false swearing or
22	perjury. Do you understand?
23	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
24	THE COURT: You're also free to ask questions and to
25	consult with Mr. Cosenza at any time during this hearing. I

	Attachment B 11/25/2009 784
1	won't continue if you advise me that you're confused or
2	uncertain about what's going on. All right?
3	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
4	THE COURT: Now are you the same Daniel Testerman who
5	was adjudged guilty by a jury on February 6th of 2006?
6	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
7	THE COURT: And have you had an opportunity to
8	review the information in the Pre-sentence Report with Mr.
9	Cosenza?
10	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
11	THE COURT: And are you aware that he's filed two
12	objections on your behalf?
13	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
14	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Cosenza, are you prepared to
15	proceed on those objections?
16	MR. COSENZA: Yes, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: All right. Fine. I understand that the
18	first one is due to the two level enhancement that the
19	Probation Officer recommends be applied for obstruction of
20	justice. I'll hear you on that one.
21	MR. COSENZA: Your Honor, I think you have enough
22	information in the objection
23	THE COURT: Okay.
24	MR. COSENZA:to rule on that. I don't have
25	anything further to add.

Attachment B 11/25/2009

THE COURT: All right. Well, let's go over the issue here. For an enhancement for obstruction of justice to apply based on the defendant's testimony, the Court has to find that a) the defendant testified falsely; b) about a material fact; and c) did willfully to obstruct justice not merely inaccurately as to a particular fact in the case. So the Government is supporting this enhancement. I know you weren't at trial, Mr. Perri, but are you convinced that those three factors were met?

MR. PERRI: Yes, Your Honor. Actually, I--I was at trial.

THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry. Why I am thinking it-no, yes, you were at trial. I've got five sentencings today.

MR. PERRI: That's okay. Yes, Your Honor, we do believe that the factors are met and--

THE COURT: Okay, what is the statement that's the false statement?

MR. PERRI: The fact that the defendant made a complete and unequivocal denial of any involvement and/or knowledge of these images on his computer. Furthermore, he denied that it was him who was responsible for the--for those images being on the computer through participation in the file share system, even though the evidence strongly indicated that it was in fact him that was using the system.

THE COURT: All right. So the material fact was--

Attachment B 11/25/2009

MR. PERRI: His complete denial.

THE COURT: And as to which Count? I mean I think this is the kind of specificity the Fourth Circuit requires on this issue.

MR. PERRI: Well, Your Honor, as to the possession count, he denied knowing possession of material and as to the received counts, he denied knowing receipt of material. I think it's as basic and as simple as that.

THE COURT: Okay. It really doesn't matter that he denied that he was the person depicted, does it?

MR. PERRI: No, it doesn't.

THE COURT: Okay. So on the possession count, knowing possession, and on the receive count, he denied knowing receipt. Now is there any significance to the fact that the Government's case was circumstantial and there wasn't any so-called smoking gun to compare the testimony?

MR. PERRI: Well, Your Honor, I think that—I think that the picture in which he was—he appeared naked, masturbating was the smoking gun actually given all the evidence, but I don't think that it matters that the case was primarily circumstantial because he got up and he testified to these things and it's by his own words that evidence is contradicted.

THE COURT: But the--that one picture was not child pornography.